



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,020	06/01/2005	Paolo Balliello	PL/2-22807/A/PCT	8510
324	7590	07/08/2009		
JoAnn Villamizar Ciba Corporation/Patent Department 540 White Plains Road P.O. Box 2005 Tarrytown, NY 10591			EXAMINER ABU ALI, SHUANGYI	
			ART UNIT 1793	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 07/08/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

andrea.dececchis@ciba.com
deborah.pinori@ciba.com
sonny.nkansa@basf.com

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1-22 remain for examination, claim 10 is canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The rejection of claims 1-5, 7, 9, 12-13, and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 4,264,552 to McMahon et al, in combination with U.S. Patent No. 2,618,632 to Klug et al. as generally set forth in the previous office action mailed 12/09/2008 stands.

The rejection of claim 6, 11, 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combined teaching of Macmahon et al. and Klug et al. , further in view of U. S. Patent No. 3,728,143 to Pollard et al. as generally set forth in the previous office action mailed 12/09/2008 stands.

The rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combined teaching of Macmahon et al. and Klug et al. et al, further in view of U. S. patent No. 5,082,498 to Kurtz et al. as generally set forth in the previous office action mailed 12/09/2008 stands.

The text of those sections of title 35 US Code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 03/11/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, the grounds of rejection for claims 1-9 and 11-22 as indicated in the previous Office Action stand.

Applicant argues that the Klug disclose the cellulose ether contains hydroxyl ethyl group and carboxymethyl group, which in the examples contain a halide in the alkyl chain. The Examiner respectfully submits that the claims fail to disclose that the R1 is an unsubstituted group. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the unsubstituted group) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that the previous submitted declaration is not need to show all embodiments of the invention. The Examiner respectfully submits that to establish unexpected results over a claimed range, applicants should compare a sufficient number of tests both inside and outside (i.e. as well as the upper and lower limits) the claimed range to show the criticality of the claimed range. *In re Hill* 284 F.2d 955, 128 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1960).

Applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine MacMahon and Klug. The Examiner respectfully submits that McMahan et al. disclose a composition

Art Unit: 1793

comprising organic pigments and an additive system, which comprises comprising a binder and an application agent. The binder can be cellulose derivatives or PVA. The application agents can be fatty acid, fatty alcohol and amines with 12-20 carbon atoms. The amount of the additive system is about 0.5-20% by weight based on the weight of the pigment. The amount of the binder based on the additive system can be about 5%. (col. 1, line 65 to col. 4, line 10 and examples). Therefore the amount of the application agent amount can be less than about 95%. Klug, also drawn to cellulose derivatives being used as binder, discloses that cellulose ether with the degree of substitution as applicants set forth in the instant application has good compatibility with various basic materials such as amines. (col. 7, lines 65-75). Applicant argues that both MacMahon and Klug fail to disclose the instant application alone. The Examiner respectfully submits that that is the reason the rejection based on U. S. C. 103 is used to reject the instant application. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant argues that MacMahon disclose in the examples that the amount of the pigment being used is less than the amount of the pigment being used in the instant application. The Examiner respectfully submits that the amount of the additive system is about 0.5-20% by weight based on the weight of the pigment, which overlaps the amount defined by the instant application. While the reference does not provide a

Art Unit: 1793

specific example which falls within the instant claims, it should be noted that "A reference can be used for all it realistically teaches and is not limited to the disclosures in its specific examples". See In re Van Marter et al 144 USPQ 421; In re Windmer et al 147 USPQ 518, 523; and In re Chapman et al 148 USPQ 711.

Since the rejection of claims 1-5,7,9,12,13 and 19-22 are valid under the combined teaching of MacMahon and Klug, the rejection of claims 6, 8, 11, and 14-18 as generally set forth in the previous office action mailed 12/09/2008 stands.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHUANGYI ABU ALI whose telephone number is (571)272-6453. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

Art Unit: 1793

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J.A. LORENZO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/S. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 1793